

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are now pending in the application. Of these pending claims, Claims 1-5, 7-9, 12, 14, 15, 19, 20, 28 and 29 are rejected and Claims 6, 8, 13, 16-18, 21-27, and 30-32 are objected to. Minor amendments have been made to the specification and claims to simply overcome the objections to the specification and rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheets", element numbering has been adjusted.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-12, 14, 15, 19, 20, 28, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Zirps et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,425,170). In view of the amendments herein, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's attention is directed to independent Claims 1, 20 and 28 which include the limitation that the mandrel collection system contains a cylindrical activation piston defining a through air passage through an exterior surface of the cylinder. These claims further contain the limitation that the through passage is configured to allow compressed gases to pass therethrough to actuate the mechanism for controlling the vacuum levels. While the Zirps reference teaches a mechanism for varying the level of

vacuum in a mandrel collection system, it does not teach the use of an aperture defined on an exterior surface of an actuating piston.

The Examiner's attention is directed to Claim 5. Claim 5 contains the limitation that the actuator piston is configured to actuate the gripping head to set a rivet having a removable mandrel. Applicants note that the piston referenced by the Examiner when citing the Zirps reference is not a piston which is configured to actuate the gripping head to set the rivet.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claims 6, 8, 13, 16-18, 21-27 and 30-32 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants have amended Claims 6, 8, 13, 21, and 30 to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, Claims 6-8, 13-18, 21-27 and 30-32 should now be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's attention is directed to Claim 7 which has been amended to depend on allowable Claim 6.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Oct 29-2004

By:



Christopher A. Eusebi
Reg. No. 44,672

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

CAE/smb